



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,072	09/19/2003	Olivier Courtin	146.1341-DIV.	7666

20311 7590 04/13/2005

MUSERLIAN, LUCAS AND MERCANTI, LLP  
475 PARK AVENUE SOUTH  
15TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NY 10016

EXAMINER

LUKTON, DAVID

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1653

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2005

*Restart / Re mail*


Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Printed 05/09/2005

REIMAIL

1066

U.S. OFFICIAL MAIL  
FIRST CLASS  
\$ 00.83  
02 1A  
3304204055 FEB 10 2005  
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 22314




AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2005

TECH CENTER 1600/2900



Organization TC1600 Bldg./Room  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. BOX 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
IF UNDELIVERABLE RETURN IN TEN DAYS  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,072	09/19/2003	Olivier Courtin	146.1341-DIV.	7666

7590

02/10/2005

Charles A. Muserlian  
c/o Muserlian, Lucas and Mercanti  
600 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10016

EXAMINER

LUKTON, DAVID

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1653

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



10/666,072

COURTIN ET AL.

## Office Action Summary

Examiner

Art Unit

David Lukton

1653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 28-31 and 33-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 34-42 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 28-31, 33, 43-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Serial No. 10/666,072  
Art Unit 1653

- 2 -

Pursuant to preliminary amendment (filed 8/11/04), claims 1-27, 32 have been cancelled, claims 28-31, 33 amended, and claims 44-49 added.

. . . .

Restriction to one of following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. §121:

- I. Claims 28-31, 33, 43-49, drawn to compounds
- II. Claims 34-42, drawn to a method of using compounds.

The inventions are distinct.

Inventions I and II are actually not related as product and process of use, because Group II is drawn to the use of any echinocandin derivative, which is not the case in Group I. However, if Group II were limited to a method of using one or more compounds of Group I, then the following form paragraph would apply:

The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP 806.05(h)).

In addition to the foregoing, applicants are required under 35 U.S.C. §121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. A "specie", in this case, is a specific compound.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added.

Serial No. 10/666,072  
Art Unit 1653

- 3 -

An argument that a generic claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentable distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 of the other invention.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier.** Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.



In response to the foregoing restriction requirement, Charles Musserlian elected

Group I in a telephone conversation on 2/3/05.

And in response to the

Serial No. 10/666,072  
Art Unit 1653

- 4 -

"election of species" requirement, C. Musserlian elected the compound defined in claim 43.

Affirmation of the foregoing election is required in response to this Office action.

Given applicants' election of Group I, it is suggested that, in response to this Office action, applicants add claims which are drawn to a method of using one or more of the compounds (or genera of compounds) that are defined in Group I. This will facilitate advancement of the prosecution. Rejoining of claims 34-42 will not take place, given the claims in their present form.



The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it in such full, clear, concise and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 28-31, 33, 43-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Applicants have proposed an assay on page 22 of the specification, but no data is presented. Accordingly, it may well be the case that the claimed compounds

are inactive. As it happens, one cannot "predict" antifungal efficacy merely by viewing the structure of a compound.

As stated in *Ex parte Forman* (230 USPQ 546, 1986) and *In re Wands* (8 USPQ2d 1400, Fed. Cir., 1988) the factors to consider in evaluating the need (or absence of need) for "undue experimentation" are the following: quantity of experimentation necessary, amount of direction or guidance presented, presence or absence of working examples, nature of the invention, state of the prior art, relative skill of those in that art, predictability or unpredictability of the art, and breadth of the claims.

Accordingly, "undue experimentation" would be required to practice the claimed invention.



Claims 28-31, 33, 43-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- In claim 28, the structural formula bears a group designated "T", which is defined as hydrogen only. However, a substituent variable must encompass multiple possibilities, otherwise it is not a variable. It is suggested that "T" be eliminated from formula III (claim 28), and that the definition of "T" be eliminated as well. The same applies in the case of claim 33.
- In claim 31, it is recited that "T" can be " $-\text{CH}_2-\text{CH}_2-\text{Nalk}_2$ ". Here, there should be parentheses around "alk", i.e.,  $-\text{CH}_2-\text{CH}_2-\text{N(alk)}_2$

Serial No. 10/666,072  
Art Unit 1653

- 6 -

- In claim 43,  $R_1$  can correspond to just one substituent group. Accordingly,  $R_1$  should be eliminated from the claim. The same applies to "a" and "b" in this claim.



Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lukton whose telephone number is 571-272-0952. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jon Weber, can be reached at 571-272-0925. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-1600.



DAVID LUKTON  
PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP 1809